

Date: Tue, 14 Sep 93 04:30:18 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #334
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 14 Sep 93 Volume 93 : Issue 334

Today's Topics:

 Neighborhood watch groups (2 msgs)
 No Frills License Application (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 11 Sep 93 16:16:11 GMT
From: mercury.hsi.com!a3bee2.radnet.com!cyphyn!randy@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Neighborhood watch groups
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

If they all have liecences , and transmit only on Amateur freq, and do not
'rebroadcast' the PD thru their rigs...(too easy to do with those silly
extended range sets...better to have a scanner separate really)....and do
not say anything that could be viewed as giving out PD info of ongoing events
then it would be ok....I'm sure others will add or modify this.

However....the real reliable range of those sets (vhf or uhf) is quite
limited, unless thru a repeater, and very few repeater groups will want a
nite after nite net on for the duration of time such watch groups would need.
So be ready for that. ok?

Idea....set up several cars at good spots to relay info from small group
to small groups when info has to be passed more than a few 1000's feet.

Make sure the PD knows you are doing the watch and which cars will be
where, visual ID info of the cars.....with Stalking Laws now appearing,
just sitting in yer car with a 2 way radio can be....hard to explain.

The short range just indicated is the RELIABLE...not iffy range, for HT type radio-to-radio with the typical rubber ducky antennas.

You'd also want to pick a freq that is not bombed by qrm from other sources, and not on a simplex freq that has regular use by others... ie...don't use 146.52 !

Oh...one more thing....you can't use code words or such....FCC rule: can't conceal the meaning of a message....and I don't think you want to use the Ten four code either.

Wish ya luck...let us know how it goes.

--
Randy KA1UNW If you get a shock while
 servicing your equipment, "Works for me!"
randy@192.153.4.200 DON'T JUMP! -Peter Keyes
 You might break an expensive tube!

Date: Mon, 13 Sep 93 09:20:35 CDT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!
robert@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Neighborhood watch groups
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

randy@cyphyn.UUCP (Randy) writes:

>
> However....the real reliable range of those sets (vhf or uhf) is quite
> limited, unless thru a repeater, and very few repeater groups will want a
> nite after nite net on for the duration of time such watch groups would need.
> So be ready for that. ok?

Or...establish your OWN repeater.

--Robert

Date: Mon, 13 Sep 93 06:31:51 CDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!
menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: No Frills License Application
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

lee@soda.berkeley.edu (Lee Thompson-Herbert) writes:

```
> In article <Du0q0B2w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>,
> robert <robert@amanda.jpunix.com> wrote:
> >gsmlrn@gsm001.mendelson.com (Geoffrey S. Mendelson) writes:
>
> [much deleted]
>
> >> You also agree that you will not use the frequency allocations of your
> >> Amateur Extra class license until you have successfully programed your keye
> >> to send the following phrase:
> >>
> >> "CQ CONTEST CQ CONTEST CQ CONTEST DE <your callsign> K"
> >
> >Then what? When someone answers (in CW), how will you read the message?
>
>
> Someone's S(arcasm)-meter is off today.
```

Ten Forty Roger, Good Buddy!

--Robert

Date: 13 Sep 93 15:00:17 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!
news@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: No Frills License Application
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2469@indep1.UUCP> clifto@indep1.UUCP (Cliff Sharp) writes:

```
>>                                The
>>                                W5GYJ
>>                                No-Code, No-Theory, No-Regulations
>>                                Amateur Radio License Application Form
```

[Deleted]...

>>Signature: _____ Date:_____

> You mean I have to know how to write, too? There's absolutely no
>place on this form for witnesses to sign after I make my mark.

I thought about having a requirement that this be notarized. To
make a perjury rap stick, I guess it would be necessary. Good point.

>>By signing below, you indicate that you **** **** *** understand
>>the provisions of Part 97 and agree to abide by them.

> Now I have to be able to _read_, too??? Dammit, I want to _talk_, not
>_read_ about talking.

Notice deleted words above. Another good point. The license applicant
could have Part 97 read to them. Or listen to an ARRL tape of it being
read. (** Marketing Opportunity **)

> Now you're discriminating against me because I'm poor.

Unfortunately, ham radio does have an economic discriminator built in.
I just wanted to transfer it from Japanese radio manufacturers to U.S.
government bureaucrats.

> (Smileys deliberately omitted to provoke the humor-impaired.)

Yeah, same here.

```
+-----+-----+
| Jim Bromley W5GYJ | | |
| Intel Corp. m/s C11-91 | | This message transmitted with |
| 5000 W. Chandler Blvd. | | 100% recycled electrons. |
| Chandler,AZ 85226 | | |
| tel: 602-554-5183 | | Internet: jrbromley@sedona.intel.com |
+-----+-----+
```

Date: 13 Sep 1993 18:34:30 GMT
From: olivea!korie!newscast.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!sunspot!
myers@uunet.uu.net
Subject: No Frills License Application
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article PFVq0B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com, robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert)
writes:

>
>Why not just have them fill out an FCC Form 505?
>
> --Robert

Isn't Form 505 no longer used?

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD 466 | Views expressed here are
*
* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *
* Myers@Cypress.West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: 14 Sep 93 05:14:28 GMT
From: olivea!apple.com!catnip!kc6sss@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2195@arrl.org>, <a05L0B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>,
<1993Sep9.221831.3302@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>s
Subject : Re: Codeless Technician

rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu (Mr. Nice Guy) writes:

> There are many operating modes possible in
>the amateur service, why is it necessary to show a high level of
>proficiency in one mode (morris) and ignoring all the other modes.

They did it so you have to do it.

That's what mothers tell their daughters when the fathers start visiting
their daughter's bedrooms at night.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #334
